REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application.

The Examiner deems allowable claim 17 if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. The Examiner rejects claims 5-12 and 24 as under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out the invention. The Examiner rejects claims 1-4 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,512,804). The Examiner rejects claims 14-16, 18-23, and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,151,334). The Examiner rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Digital Visual Interface (DVI) version 1.0.

The Applicants cancel claim 1 and amend claims 2-7, 9-20, and 22-25.

The Applicants add no new matter and request reconsideration.

Claims Allowable

The Applicants thank Examiner Nguyen for allowing claim 17 if rewritten independent form to include all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. Claim 17 is in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under § 112

The Applicants rewrite claim 5 in independent form to include all the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. And the Applicants amend claim 5 to provide antecedent basis for "the leading edge pointer."

The Applicants amend claim 6 to depend from claim 5 thereby obviating the Examiner's § 112 rejections.

The Applicants amend claim 24 to provide antecedent basis for "for the reload pointer."

Claims 5-12 are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections Under § 102(e) and 103(a)

Claim 4 recites *a serial to parallel converter...to generate a parallel reference clock responsive to the serial reference clock associated with the plurality of serial data channels*. Johnson discloses a receiver 10 in which "each channel regenerator has a phase-locked loop (PLL) and a high-speed serial-to-parallel converter. The regenerator receives differentially-

encoded analog signals and generates, using the PLL, a clock signal 26 for sampling the analog signal." Johnson, column 2, lines 50-54. The receiver 10, therefore, does not receive a serial reference clock nor does it generate a parallel reference clock responsive to the serial reference clock as recited in claim 4.

Claim 14 recites *an alignment detection circuit to generate a plurality of read pointers corresponding to the plurality of input parallel data channels....* Claim 25 includes a similar limitation. Nowhere does Kim disclose generating a plurality of read pointers corresponding to the plurality of input parallel data channels.

As the Examiner correctly points out, Kim discloses a removing unit 24 that receives a single serial data channel 28 and a clock signal 32 (column 4, line22). But a serial to parallel converter 72 converts the serial stream 28 into a *single* k-bit parallel data word 83 (column 11, lines 61-62). A word aligner 73 uses the idle characters in the data stream for bit and word synchronization (column 12, lines 13-15). A demultiplexor 74 receives the *bits* of the *single* parallel word and generates a plurality of outputs 88a, 88b, and so on. The demultiplexor 74 appears to operate responsive to the stream selector 76 (Figure 7 and column 12, lines 41-44). Thus, Kim does not disclose an alignment circuit that generates a plurality of read pointers, much less a plurality of read pointers that correspond to the plurality of input parallel data channels.

Claim 14 further recites *a plurality of FIFO circuits ...to generate the output parallel data responsive to the plurality of read pointers*. Claim 25 includes a similar limitation. Even if the Examiner considered Kim's signal 86 as disclosing the recited plurality of read pointers, the data buffer 78 does not operate responsive to signal 86 as required by claim 14. And neither the demultiplexor 74 nor the stream selector 76 operate as further recited in claims 15-16, 18-23, and 25-33 relative to the leading edge signal and edge pointers. Kim simply does not disclose the invention recited in claims 14-16, 18-23, and 25-33.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of all claims as amended. The Applicants encourage the Examiner to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of all claims as amended. The Applicants encourage the Examiner to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Graciela G. Cowger
Reg. No. 42,444

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number 1-703-872-9306, on April 15, 2004.

Signature

Lauren Ballard-Gemmell